

1 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP  
A Limited Liability Partnership  
2 Including Professional Corporations  
NEIL A.F. POPOVIC, Cal. Bar No. 132403  
3 ANNA S. McLEAN, Cal. Bar No. 142233  
TENAYA RODEWALD, Cal. Bar No. 248563  
4 JOY O. SIU, Cal. Bar No. 307610  
DANIEL R. FONG, Cal. Bar No. 311985  
5 Four Embarcadero Center, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4109  
6 Telephone: 415.434.9100  
Facsimile: 415.434.3947  
7 Email: npopovic@sheppardmullin.com  
amclean@sheppardmullin.com  
8 rodewald@sheppardmullin.com  
jsiu@sheppardmullin.com  
9 dfong@sheppardmullin.com

10 Attorneys for Defendant,  
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC  
11

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
14

15 IN RE SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC  
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:16-cv-00523-JCS

16  
17 CONSOLIDATED ACTION  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL  
CERTAIN DOCUMENT FILED IN  
CONJUNCTION WITH SEAGATE'S  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
RENEWED MOTION FOR CLASS  
CERTIFICATION**

1 The Court has reviewed the Administrative Motion to Seal Certain Documents Filed in  
 2 Connection with Seagate’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Renewed Motion for Class Certification. It  
 3 has also reviewed the Declaration of Daniel R. Fong, filed by Seagate Technology LLC  
 4 (“Seagate”) in Support of the Administrative Motion to Seal, and its attached Declaration of Allen  
 5 Ng. Therefore, the Court rules as follows.

6 In this district, a party seeking to file a document under seal must satisfy a two-step  
 7 process. The party must “(1) comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5; and (2) rebut the [] strong  
 8 presumption in favor of access that applies to all documents other than grand jury transcripts or  
 9 pre-indictment warrant materials.” *Gaudin v. Saxon Mortg. Servs.*, No. 11-cv-01663-JST, 2013  
 10 2013 WL 2631074, at \*1, 2 (N.D. Cal. June 11, 2013) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

11 The first prong requires that the party seeking to seal the document establish that (1) “the  
 12 document or portions thereof is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to  
 13 protection under the law; and (2) is narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.”  
 14 *Id.* (citing Civil L.R. 79-5).

15 “With respect to the second prong, the showing required for overcoming the strong  
 16 presumption of access depends on the type of motion to which the document is attached.” *Id.*  
 17 With regard to dispositive motions, the “presumption can be overcome only if the party presents  
 18 ‘compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of  
 19 access and the public policies favoring disclosure.’” *Id.* (quoting *Damakana v. City and Cnty. of*  
 20 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)). With regard to non-dispositive motions, the  
 21 Ninth Circuit has “carved out an exception to the presumption of access to judicial records[,]” and  
 22 those records may be filed under seal upon a showing of “good cause.” *In re Midland Nat. Life*  
 23 *Ins. Co. Annuity Sales Practices Litig.*, 686 F.3d 1115, 1119 (9th Cir. 2012) (per curiam) (internal  
 24 quotation marks and citation omitted); *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir.  
 25 2010) (applying “good cause” standard to all non-dispositive motions because such motions “are  
 26 often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action”) (internal quotation  
 27 marks and citation omitted). “[T]he vast majority of other courts within this circuit” apply the  
 28 “good cause” standard to sealing documents filed in connection with a Motion for Class

1 Certification. *See In re High-Tech Emp. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 5:11-cv-02509-LHK, 2013 WL  
 2 5486230, at \*2 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2013) (collecting cases); *Gaudin*, 2013 WL 2631074, at \*2  
 3 (same); *Dugan v. Lloyds TSB Bank, PLC*, No. 12-cv-02549-WHA (NJV), 2013 WL 1435223, at  
 4 \*1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2013) (“Unless the denial of a motion for class certification would constitute  
 5 the death knell of a case, ‘the vast majority of courts within this circuit’ treat motions for class  
 6 certification as non-dispositive standard applies”) (internal formatting omitted).

7 The confidential information proposed to be filed under seal satisfies the Northern  
 8 District’s two-part test. First, Seagate has narrowly tailored its request seeks to seal only two  
 9 paragraphs that are “privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection  
 10 under the law.” L.R. 79-5(b). Second, good cause exists to protect Seagate’s sensitive business  
 11 information from being released to competitors or to the public.

12 **A. Exhibit 25 Contains Contain Trade Secrets and Confidential Information**

13 The Ninth Circuit has adopted the definition of “trade secrets” set forth in the Restatement  
 14 of Torts, holding that “[a] trade secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation  
 15 of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an  
 16 advantage over competitors who do not know or use it.” *In re High-Tech Emp. Antitrust Litig.*,  
 17 2013 WL 163779, at \*1 (citing *Clark v. Bunker*, 453 F.2d 1006, 1009 (9th Cir. 1972)). Generally,  
 18 a trade secret “relates to the production of good . . . . It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or  
 19 to other operations in the business . . . .” *Id.*; *see also Muench Photography, Inc. v. Pearson*  
 20 *Educ., Inc.*, No. 12-cv-01927-WHO, 2013 WL 01927, at \*4-5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2013) (sealing  
 21 document containing information relating to requesting party’s “product development efforts and  
 22 business strategies to competitors,” when “competitors could use these strategies themselves—  
 23 strategies that [the requesting party] spent significant resources to create”).

24 As explained in the Ng Declaration, the information sought to be sealed involves Seagate’s  
 25 relationship with its OEM customers and those OEM’s non-public business strategies on how to  
 26 respond to potential product issues. Thus, the information is sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5  
 27 as protectable trade secret information and/or otherwise protectable by law. *See Gaudin*, 2013 WL  
 28 2631074, at \*2.

**B. Good Cause Supports Seagate's Request to Seal the Confidential Information**

There is also "good cause" to seal the requested information. *Gaudin*, 2013 WL 2631074, at \*2. Seagate, in addition to its OEM customers, take considerable effort to ensure all of this information is kept from the public; indeed, this information was only disclosed in this case pursuant to a stipulated Protective Order. Ng Decl. ¶ 3. The information is also commercially sensitive and highly valuable to Seagate and its OEM customers. *Id.* ¶¶ 18-19. Should information regarding Seagate's and its OEM customer's business strategies be disclosed to public, it could be used to harm Seagate's and its OEM customers' "competitive standing." *Id.*, ¶ 5; *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (sealing appropriate to prevent documents from being used to harm to litigant's competitive standing); *Muench Photography, Inc.*, 2013 WL 4475900, at \*4-5.

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, the Administrative Motion to Seal is GRANTED. The documents identified below shall remain filed under seal:

Document Filed Under Seal by Plaintiffs	Portion(s) Sought To Be Sealed
Declaration of Tenaya M. Rodewald in Support of Seagate Technology LLC's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for Class Certification	Exhibit 25, ¶¶ 105-106

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JOSEPH C. SPERO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE